

**To:** Mandel, Arthur[Arthur.Mandel@mail.house.gov]  
**From:** Plevin, Lisa  
**Sent:** Mon 2/25/2013 9:24:16 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Ffs

According to staff, unlike the Hudson River, which flows in only one direction, the Passaic flows both ways depending on the tidal cycle. Therefore it is much less important to dredge from "upstream" to "downstream" (as we try to do in the Hudson). Moreover, the sediment that comes up from Newark Bay into the Passaic is actually more contaminated than the sediment that flows down into the lower 8 miles from the upper 9 miles. Specifically, the contaminant flux moving upstream ( during the incoming tide) from the lower eight miles of the Passaic is greater than the flux moving downstream from above RM 8.3. Reason being there is a much greater volume of contaminated sediment moving around below RM 8.3.

Lisa J Plevin  
Chief of Staff  
US EPA Region 2  
(212) 637-5000

-----Original Message-----

From: Mandel, Arthur [mailto:Arthur.Mandel@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 9:41 AM  
To: Plevin, Lisa  
Subject: RE: Ffs

Thanks for the response. Their other argument seems to be that we shouldn't start any work in the lower 8 because it will just have to be redone once work on the upper part of the river starts since that will move contamination back downstream... any thoughts on that one?

-----Original Message-----

From: Plevin, Lisa [mailto:Plevin.Lisa@epa.gov]  
Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 8:59 AM  
To: Mandel, Arthur  
Subject: RE: Ffs

Hi Artie. Sorry for delay. Was away.

The reason the FFS was undertaken, even while the RI/FS was being done by the CPG, was to get remediation started earlier in the lower 8 miles where 2/3 of the dioxin or more is located. The lower eight miles contains about 90% of the contaminated fine grain sediments and they are fairly ubiquitous therefore requiring a bank to bank remediation approach.

Here is the key fact: We know the lower 8 will require bank-to-bank remediation (the PRPs disagree), and we therefore know that any appropriate remedy we pick for the lower 8 will be consistent with the remedy ultimately selected for the entire 17-mile river.

The FFS will allow us to pick a remedy for the lower 8 and get it started 3 or more years earlier than if we wait for the entire RI/FS to be completed. Let me know if you have more questions. Lisa

-----Original Message-----

From: Mandel, Arthur [mailto:Arthur.Mandel@mail.house.gov]  
Sent: Friday, February 22, 2013 5:33 PM

To: Plevin, Lisa  
Subject: Ffs

Hi lisa- I think you all may be aware but the cpgs are going around in our district touting their own plan and knocking the ffs because it does "nothing for the other 9 miles of thr river." I wasn't around back then but do you have a quick and dirty explanation we could share with folks as to why the ffs was broken off from the entire lower passaic study, why this decision was made and how the two studies complement each other?

Thanks and have a good weekend  
-ALM

ÿ